



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,305	09/22/2003	Thomas Goering	11884-400201	5450
23838	7590	03/06/2006	EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON LLP 1500 K STREET N.W. SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			SINGH, RACHNA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/665,305

Applicant(s)

GOERING, THOMAS

Examiner

Rachna Singh

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 09/22/03.
2. Claims 1-19 are pending. Claims 1, 9, 17, and 19 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hitchcock et al., US 2005/0080756 A1, 04/14/05 (filed 09/29/03, Provisional Application filed on 06/04/98).

In reference to claims 1 and 9, Hitchcock teaches a method and system for a universal forms engine allowing data sharing between customizable admissions applications. See abstract and page 1, paragraph [0008]-[0012]. Compare to “**a computer system for generating output modules in a form-based application runtime environment**”. Hitchcock discloses the following features:

-A form engine that permits the creation and processing of customizable electronic forms and selective sharing of information between customized forms. A user enters data only once, and the data is shared through an extensible database between disparate forms. The forms engine presents a form to a user for input, receives data from the user, provides the data to the appropriate entity. The forms engine integrates the form and the data. User information and application information are abstracted from

the coding, that is the user information and application information is stored in a way that allows the application information and user information to be changed without reprogramming. This abstraction allows a set of user data to be extended without reprogramming, allows user data to be displayed in different formats, and allows the data to be validated. See page 1, paragraphs [0011]-[00015]. The forms engine uses the application data file to produce the requested application in HTML format for display. The application description file can be easily modified, for example to change labels or to add additional fields without reprogramming the forms engine. See page 5, paragraph [0065]. The application data file can be instructed to override default values and can be customized. See page 6, paragraph [0080]. Compare to ***"a form manager component configured to receive an indication that a reusable form element has been changed, determine which of the output modules from a set of output modules are affected by the changed form element, and invalidate the affected output modules"***.

-Creating forms, parsing data on the forms, storing data, retrieving data, and deploying data onto other forms. New forms are automatically populated with the previously entered data. See page 1, paragraph [0012]. The applicant database can be extended to include new attributes without making any changes to the forms engine program or to the application files of institutions that chose not to include the new data. The forms engine automatically uses the application data file to produce the requested application in HTML format for display on the applicant's browser. The application description file can be easily modified, for example, to change labels or to add additional fields. The

appearance of the application for each institution can be changed by changing its application description file, without reprogramming the forms engine. The completed application is transmitted to the institution with the data in any format that the institution prefers. The institution can therefore upload the data directly into its applicant or student information system database, merging the information seamlessly into their existing workflow, thereby avoiding the additional expense and errors of re-keyboarding the information. The forms engine thus has the capability of outputting application information universally across platforms. See page 5, paragraph [0065]. Compare to ***“a runtime manager component configured to receive a request for an output module from the set of output modules and cause regeneration of the requested output module if the requested output module has been invalidated”***.

The claimed “invalidate” step is a means to indicate that the current form (output module) is not valid because of the element change. Hitchcock does not expressly state the output module is invalidated; however, he does teach that as the user enters or customizes data only once, and the data is shared through an extensible database between disparate forms. The institution can therefore upload the data directly into its applicant or student information system database, merging the information seamlessly into their existing workflow, thereby avoiding the additional expense and errors of re-keyboarding the information. The forms engine thus has the capability of outputting application information universally across platforms. See page 5, paragraph [0065]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that Hitchcock’s ability to merge information and data changes to other forms

would entail invalidating other related forms containing incorrect data because the Hitchcock's system is equipped with the ability to "share" data among common application elements (i.e. address info, name) in order to cut down on redundancy and avoid the additional expense and errors of re-keyboarding information in multiple forms having the same data. See page 5, paragraph [0065] and page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0006].

In reference to claims 2 and 10, Hitchcock teaches that after the applicant completes an application for one institution, the data is saved in a database and automatically populates fields in subsequent application forms. See abstract.

In reference to claims 3 and 11, Hitchcock teaches the Application Data File is a specially formatted text file that acts as an application description. It is a series of "directives" and optional arguments which the forms engine parses to build the HTML form and to merge in user data. The directives are interpreted by means of a look-up in a data structure that stores the directive interpretations. See page 6, paragraph [0080].

In reference to claims 4 and 12, Hitchcock does not expressly state the output module is invalidated by marking a flag associated with the module; however, he does teach that as the user enters or customizes data only once, and the data is shared through an extensible database between disparate forms. The claimed "invalidate" step is a means to indicate that the current form (output module) is not valid because of the element change. The institution can therefore upload the data directly into its applicant or student information system database, merging the information seamlessly into their existing workflow, thereby avoiding the additional expense and errors of re-keyboarding

the information. The forms engine thus has the capability of outputting application information universally across platforms. See page 5, paragraph [0065]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that Hitchcock's ability to merge information and data changes to other forms would entail invalidating other related forms containing incorrect data because the Hitchcock's system is equipped with the ability to "share" data among common application elements (i.e. address info, name) in order to cut down on redundancy and avoid the additional expense and errors of re-keyboarding information in multiple forms having the same data. See page 5, paragraph [0065] and page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0006].

In reference to claims 5 and 13, Hitchcock teaches creating forms, parsing data on the forms, storing data, retrieving data, and deploying data onto other forms. New forms are automatically populated with the previously entered data. See page 1, paragraph [0012]. The applicant database can be extended to include new attributes without making any changes to the forms engine program or to the application files of institutions that chose not to include the new data. The forms engine automatically uses the application data file to produce the requested application in HTML format for display on the applicant's browser. The application description file can be easily modified, for example, to change labels or to add additional fields. The appearance of the application for each institution can be changed by changing its application description file, without reprogramming the forms engine. The completed application is transmitted to the institution with the data in any format that the institution prefers. The institution can therefore upload the data directly into its applicant or student information system

database, merging the information seamlessly into their existing workflow, thereby avoiding the additional expense and errors of re-keyboarding the information. The forms engine thus has the capability of outputting application information universally across platforms. This step would entail identifying those forms for which the changes are to be merged. See page 5, paragraph [0065].

In reference to claims 6 and 14, Hitchcock teaches most institutions have application date windows during which applications, whether electronic or paper, for a particular term are accepted. The forms engine verifies that the application is being submitted within the allowed window. Unlike pre-printed paper applications, however, the invention provides the schools the flexibility of easily changing the application date window, so that the time to apply can be extended if the institution wants to receive additional applications. Forms engine uses data from the appropriate application data file (FIG. 14) and previously entered user data to generate a page of a form. See page 4, paragraphs [0053]-[0054].

In reference to claims 7 and 15, Hitchcock disclose a template file gives the application developer absolute freedom to quickly update the application with no need to rewrite or add program code to the forms engine. Use of templates also dramatically reduces the number of functions needed by the engine, as well as the execution overhead. The template file can be in the form of specially tagged HTML; that is, instead of a line-by-line set of directives, the template can look like HTML with embedded special tags representing the form element/variable/value to interpolate. To process the template, the forms engine need only look for <QUESTION> . . .

</QUESTION> sections and parse them. Many other pieces of logic could also be embedded into the templates.

In reference to claims 8 and 16, Hitchcock teaches the application description file can be easily modified, for example, to change labels or to add additional fields. The appearance of the application for each institution can be changed by changing its application description file, without reprogramming the forms engine. The completed application is transmitted to the institution with the data in any format that the institution prefers. The institution can therefore upload the data directly into its applicant or student information system database, merging the information seamlessly into their existing workflow, thereby avoiding the additional expense and errors of re-keyboarding the information. The forms engine thus has the capability of outputting application information universally across platforms. See page 5, paragraph [0065].

In reference to claims 17-18, Hitchcock teaches an applicant database that can be extended to include new attributes without making any changes to the forms engine program or to the application files of institutions that chose not to include the new data. The forms engine automatically uses the application data file to produce the requested application in HTML format for display on the applicant's browser. The application description file can be easily modified, for example, to change labels or to add additional fields. The appearance of the application for each institution can be changed by changing its application description file, without reprogramming the forms engine. The completed application is transmitted to the institution with the data in any format that the institution prefers. The institution can therefore upload the data directly into its applicant

or student information system database, merging the information seamlessly into their existing workflow, thereby avoiding the additional expense and errors of re-keyboarding the information. The forms engine thus has the capability of outputting application information universally across platforms. See page 5, paragraph [0065]. Compare to **« responsive to a call to start a form output process based on an identified form: determining whether a previously generated output module associated with the identified form in the output module library has been marked as invalid; if so: regenerating the output module;**

Hitchcock does not teach **“storing the regenerated output module in the output module library along with a marker to indicate that the output module is valid”**. A library is a collection of documents (or output modules). Hitchcock teaches storing forms in a application system database (same as library). The claimed “invalidate” step is a means to indicate that the current form (output module) is not valid because of the element change. Hitchcock does not expressly state the output module is marked as invalid in a library; however, he does teach that as the user enters or customizes data only once, and the data is shared through an extensible database between disparate forms. The institution can therefore upload the data directly into its applicant or student information system database, merging the information seamlessly into their existing workflow, thereby avoiding the additional expense and errors of re-keyboarding the information. The forms engine thus has the capability of outputting application information universally across platforms. See page 5, paragraph [0065]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention that Hitchcock's ability to merge information and data changes to other forms would entail invalidating other related forms containing incorrect data because the Hitchcock's system is equipped with the ability to "share" data among common application elements (i.e. address info, name) in order to cut down on redundancy and avoid the additional expense and errors of re-keyboarding information in multiple forms having the same data. See page 5, paragraph [0065] and page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0006].

In reference to claim 19, Hitchcock teaches creating forms, parsing data on the forms, storing data, retrieving data, and deploying data onto other forms. New forms are automatically populated with the previously entered data. See page 1, paragraph [0012]. The applicant database can be extended to include new attributes without making any changes to the forms engine program or to the application files of institutions that chose not to include the new data. The forms engine automatically uses the application data file to produce the requested application in HTML format for display on the applicant's browser. The application description file can be easily modified, for example, to change labels or to add additional fields. The appearance of the application for each institution can be changed by changing its application description file, without reprogramming the forms engine. The completed application is transmitted to the institution with the data in any format that the institution prefers. The institution can therefore upload the data directly into its applicant or student information system database, merging the information seamlessly into their existing workflow, thereby avoiding the additional expense and errors of re-keyboarding the information. The forms

engine thus has the capability of outputting application information universally across platforms. See page 5, paragraph [0065]. A library is a collection of documents (or output modules). Hitchcock teaches storing forms in a application system database (same as library). Compare to ***“upon revision to a form element, identifying a form element membership information which forms form a form library are associated with the revised form element”***

Hitchcock does not expressly state ***marking each of the identified forms in the form library as invalid***; however, he does teach that as the user enters or customizes data only once, and the data is shared through an extensible database between disparate forms. The institution can therefore upload the data directly into its applicant or student information system database, merging the information seamlessly into their existing workflow, thereby avoiding the additional expense and errors of re-keyboarding the information. The forms engine thus has the capability of outputting application information universally across platforms. See page 5, paragraph [0065]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that Hitchcock's ability to merge information and data changes to other forms would entail invalidating other related forms containing incorrect data because the Hitchcock's system is equipped with the ability to “share” data among common application elements (i.e. address info, name) in order to cut down on redundancy and avoid the additional expense and errors of re-keyboarding information in multiple forms having the same data. See page 5, paragraph [0065] and page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0006].

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Paoli et al. US 2004/0268229 A1

Chapus US 2005/0183002 A1

Murren et al. US 2004/0205525 A1

Dziejma US 2005/0028084 A1

Borg US 2004/0205530 A1

Mikhailov et al. US 6,968,500 B2

Kennedy et al. US 6,651,217 B1

Balz US 2005/0086587 A1

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh whose telephone number is 571-272-4099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30AM-6:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 2176

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RS

02/15/06


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100